

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In paragraph 3.1, on page 3 of the Office Action dated January 30, 2004 in the current application, the Examiner indicated that a single claim, namely Claim 47 was rejected for prior art reasons. Accordingly this one claim has been canceled.

In paragraph 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 48-52 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 48-52 have been rewritten in independent form. The Examiner is hereby requested to independently verify that all necessary limitations are present in each of these claims, and if so then allow these claims.

In paragraph 5, on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 11-46 and 53-79 were allowed over the prior art of record. Hence these claims have been kept unchanged.

The only remaining issue is related to references being cited by Applicants as discussed by the Examiner in page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, in paragraph 2, on page 2 the Examiner asked if the microfiche cards in the file were the references being cited. Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to a paragraph in the originally-filed application at page 1 line 26 to page 2 line 2 where the microfiches are described as containing "source code in the C language for programming a computer" and as being "a part of the present disclosure" and "incorporated by reference." Additional references to the microfiche are found throughout the originally-filed application, e.g. see page 18 lines 13-15 and lines 21-23. Accordingly, the microfiche in the file is an integral part of the detailed description of the present invention that is being patented (i.e. the microfiche is NOT to be treated as prior art).

Regarding the 24-sheet Part B of the Information Disclosure Statement, Applicants did not submit copies of the cited references because preparation and transmission of copies of all these references places an undue burden on Applicants. Instead, Applicants respectfully requested the Examiner to review three USPTO files in which these references were previously submitted, namely:

US Patent 6,175,946,
US Patent 6,609,229 and
US Patent Application 10/348,116.

As noted in the bottom half of page 22 of the prior amendment dated October 10, 2003, all references in the 24-sheet Part B of the Information Disclosure Statement are to be found in the above-identified three USPTO files (called "checkers" family).

Applicants have previously stated (in the prior amendment dated October 10, 2003) that these references are believed to be relevant to a number of claims in the current application, e.g. see Claims 15 and 78 (this is an exemplary list and not exhaustive, and the Examiner is requested to carefully review all of the above claims).

Moreover, Applicants previously requested the current Examiner to carefully review the file history of the "checkers" family to take into account all the arguments being made for and against patentability in the various office actions and amendments therein. See the prior amendment dated October 10, 2003.

Finally, Applicants hereby respectfully thank the Examiner for pointing out (in the un-numbered paragraph below paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action) that the article by Heinrich et al. was not included in any of the 1449s. Accordingly Applicants submit herewith a 1449 containing just this one reference, and a copy of the reference is also attached hereto.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims 11-46 and 48-79 in view of all cited references. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8200, extension 3.

**Via Express Mail Label No.
EV 448 867 042 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Omkar K. Suryadevara
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,320